



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

In reply to Adams and colleagues (correspondence)

Citation for published version:

Hutton, P, Taylor, PJ & Morrison, AP 2015, 'In reply to Adams and colleagues (correspondence)', *Psychosis: Psychological, Social and Integrative Approaches*, vol. 7, no. 4.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17522439.2015.1093017>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/17522439.2015.1093017](https://doi.org/10.1080/17522439.2015.1093017)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Psychosis: Psychological, Social and Integrative Approaches

Publisher Rights Statement:

Paul Hutton, Peter J. Taylor & Anthony P. Morrison (2015) In reply to Adams and colleagues, *Psychosis*, 7:4, 367-367, DOI: 10.1080/17522439.2015.1093017

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



RE: Hutton P. et al. Cognitive behavioural therapy for psychosis: rationale and protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis.

Dear Editor

We disagree with the Cochrane Schizophrenia Group's (CSzG) self-assessment that the problems we identified in their reviews of popular antipsychotics for schizophrenia are not serious. We encourage people to read our 2012 (1) paper where we document the problems in great detail and their likely impact on estimates of efficacy. We have not examined their impact on estimates of adverse effects, but we invite readers to do so.

We reject Professor Adam's claim that the CSzG was not forewarned that there were serious problems with their review of cognitive behavioural therapy for psychosis (2). In a meeting with the CSzG Editors in 2012, one of us (Paul Hutton) called for both it and their review of risperidone (3) to be retracted, fixed and then re-issued. Despite assurances that our concerns would be followed up, we have received no correspondence since then. Both these reviews contain multiple errors which greatly undermine their negative conclusions, yet both have been allowed to continue to influence public policy and debate.

As discussed at the 2012 meeting, we believe the CSzG system for documenting and responding to constructive criticism and feedback is neither transparent nor effective. Until there is evidence of improved responsiveness, we encourage readers to submit their critical feedback to independent and peer-reviewed journals, as we have done.

Yours sincerely

Paul Hutton
Peter J Taylor
Anthony P Morrison

References

1. Hutton P, Morrison AP, Yung AR, Taylor PJ, French P, Dunn G. Effects of drop-out on efficacy estimates in five Cochrane reviews of popular antipsychotics for schizophrenia. *Acta Psychiatr Scand.* 2012;126(1):1-11.
2. Jones C, Hacker D, Cormac I, Meaden A, Irving CB. Cognitive behaviour therapy versus other psychosocial treatments for schizophrenia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2012;4:CD008712.
3. Rattehalli RD, Jayaram MB, Smith M. Risperidone versus placebo for schizophrenia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2010(1):CD006918.